REMARKS

Claim 22 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 11, 21 and 23 have been amended. The features of cancelled claim 22 have been incorporated into independent claims 11 and 21. Additional support for the claim amendments can be found at paragraph [0037] of the specification.

Claims 11-21 and 23 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the drawing objections:

Reference numerals 54 and 72 have been deleted from the specification. Therefore, the drawing objections have been overcome.

Regarding the objection to claim 23:

Claim 23 has been amended based upon the Examiner's comments at page 2 of the Office Action. Therefore, the objection is overcome.

Regarding the 102 rejections:

Claims 11-15, 18 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,365,498):

Claim 11 has been amended to recite:

"A circuit device provided on a substrate and comprising:
a single active semiconductor component arranged on the substrate and having an outer electrical contact surface; and
at least one electrical connection line on the substrate to contact with the outer electrical contact surface of the single active semiconductor component,
wherein
the electrical connection line is part of at least one discrete passive electrical component arranged on the substrate, **the electrical connection line contacts the outer electrical contact surface at an electrical contact, such that the electrical contact faces away from the substrate, and**
a layer of electrically insulating film is laminated onto the semiconductor component and the substrate in such a way that the electrical contact is exposed."

Claim 21 recites features somewhat similar to those recited in amended claim 11. Chu fails to discuss the features recited in claims 11 and 21, for example.

In contrast, Chu discusses an IC device 20 built on a silicon substrate 22. An aluminum

bonding pad 24 or bonding pads formed of other highly conductive metal are first formed by a metal deposition process followed by a photolithographic patterning method. After the formation of the bonding pad 24, a passivation layer 28 is deposited on tope of the bonding pad 24 for insulation purpose. A photolithographic method is then used to pattern windows on the bonding pad 24 through the passivation layer 28 such that a conductive surface on the bonding pads is exposed. The exposed top surface 34 is then covered by an adhesion layer 30 in a sputtering deposition process (see column 5, lines 45-60, for example).

In the Office Action, the Examiner compares the IC device 20 of Chu, as a whole, to the Applicants' "semiconductor component". However, the Applicants respectfully assert that the IC device 20 of Chu is not comparable to "***a single active*** semiconductor component" as recited in amended claim 11, for example.

Further, the Examiner asserts that the IC device 20 includes an electrical contact surface (i.e., the top surface 34 of the bond pad 24 in FIG. 3). When the bond pad 24 is viewed as part of the IC device 20, however, it surface 34 is not an electrical contact surface, considering the fact that it is already covered by the adhesive layer 30, therefore making the surface 34 **an inner part of the IC device 20**. That is, Chu fails to discuss "a single active semiconductor component arranged on the substrate and **having an outer electrical contact surface**" as recited in amended claims 11 and 21, for example.

Further, the passivation layer 28 of Chu is on the bottom of the IC device 20, and therefore, is not comparable to the "electrically insulating film" as recited in amended claims 11 and 21, for example. Further, in FIG. 3, the passivation layer 28 does not expose the contact surface 34 of the bond pad 24.

Therefore, independent claims 11 and 21 patentably distinguish over Chu. In addition, since dependent claims 12-15 18 and 23 depend respectively from independent claims 11 and 21, these claims also patentably distinguish over Chu.

Therefore, withdrawal of the 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 103 rejections:

Claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of Iseki et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0036345):

Claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from independent claim 11. Therefore, the comments mentioned above, may also be applied here.

In addition, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Chu fails to discuss

"wherein the semiconductor component is a power semiconductor component" as recited in claims 16 and 19. In addition, the Examiner admits that Chu fails to discuss "wherein the power semiconductor component is selected from the group consisting of MOSFETs, IGBTs and bipolar transistors" as recited in claims 17 and 20. However, the Examiner asserts that Iseki discusses these features.

The Applicants respectfully submit that although Iseki discusses that the semiconductor device thereof may be a power semiconductor device or a power IC, Iseki fails to discuss the deficiencies of Chu as mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of Iseki and Chu fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or discuss all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *See* M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4/24/2007

By: _____
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501